# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

AUG 3 0 2011

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy

Courts for the District of Columbia

Robert W. Harrell, in his official capacity as Speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and Glenn F. McConnell, in his official capacity as President Pro Tempore of the South Carolina Senate 1100 Gervais Street Columbia, SC 29201-6215  Plaintiff,	Civil Action No.:
Vs.  The United States of America U.S. Attorney For the District of Columbia Civil Division  4 <sup>th</sup> Floor 501 Third Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530  Eric H. Holder, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States Office of General Counsel Justice Management Division Department of Justice 145 N Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20530  Defendants.	Case: 1:11-cv-01566 Assigned To : Sullivan, Emmet G. Assign. Date : 8/30/2011 Description: 3-Judge Court
,	

# COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED, 42 U.S.C. § 1973C, AND REQUEST FOR THREE-JUDGE COURT

Plaintiffs Robert W. Harrell, in his official capacity as Speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and Glenn F. McConnell, in his official capacity as President Pro Tempore of the South Carolina Senate, bring this action for declaratory judgment pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c, (hereinafter

"Section 5"), and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, et seq. The Plaintiffs respectfully would show the Court the following:

1. This action is filed for the purpose of obtaining a declaratory judgment that H. 3992, a bill signed into law by the Governor of South Carolina on August 1, 2011, satisfies Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act because it has neither the purpose nor the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, or of diminishing minority voters' ability to elect their preferred candidates of choice, and that H. 3992 may be enforced by Plaintiffs.. H. 3992 creates new district boundaries for electing members of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina (the "House") and affects the nomination and election of members of the House through a redistricting process that is based on the 2010 decennial population data from the United States Census Bureau ("2010 Census").

#### **Parties**

- 2. Plaintiffs Robert W. Harrell and Glenn McConnell are the persons expressly authorized and directed by Section 4 of H. 3992 to seek judicial or administrative approval of the Bill as required by Section 5.
- 3. The United States is a proper Defendant in this action because "[a] State or political subdivision [covered by Section 5] wishing to make use of a recent amendment to its voting laws ... has a concrete and immediate 'controversy' with the Federal Government." *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 335 (1966).
- 4. Eric H. Holder, Jr. is a proper defendant in his official capacity as the Attorney General of the United States and is principally responsible for enforcing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, including the defense of Section 5 litigation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. 42 U.S.C § 1973c(a).

## Jurisdiction and Venue

- 5. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, under which this Court is authorized to issue the declaratory judgment Plaintiffs seek. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973c and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 6. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Section 5, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c, and 28 U.S.C. § 2284.

# Three-Judge Panel Required and Requested

- Rights Act of 1965, see 28 C.F.R. Pt. 51, App., changes to the districts from which members of the United States House of Representatives are elected are subject to Section 5. Section 5 provides that no voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964 may be enforced unless and until the State (a) obtains a declaratory judgment from this Court that the qualification, prerequisite, standard, or procedure has neither the purpose nor the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in 42 U.S.C. §1973b(2); or (b) submits the qualification, prerequisite, standard, or procedure to the Attorney General for administrative review and preclearance and an objection is not interposed to the State's enforcement of the qualification, prerequisite, standard, or procedure.
- 8. This action is properly determinable by a district court of three judges in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 1973c and 28 U.S.C. § 2284.
- 9. Simultaneously with the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiffs are seeking administrative Section 5 preclearance. Substantial factual information regarding the voting

changes at issue has been presented to Defendants in connection with the administrative Section 5 submission.

### Factual Allegations

- 10. The 2010 Census reveals that South Carolina's population has increased to a total of 4,625,364 persons, which represents a 15.3% increase in total population in South Carolina over the 2000 South Carolina population of 4,012,012.
- 11. The residents of South Carolina currently are entitled to elect a total of six representatives to the United States House of Representatives. Due to the population increase reflected in the 2010 Census, South Carolina residents now are entitled to elect seven representatives to the United States House of Representatives.
- 12. Article I, § 2 of the United States Constitution requires that a census of the United States be conducted every ten years and that Representatives be chosen "by the People of the several States."
- 13. Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution requires that members of the United States House of Representatives be apportioned among the states according to their respective population numbers.
- 14. The United States Supreme Court has held that "as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1964).
- 15. In adherence to these Constitutional and legal requirements and following lengthy debates and the adoption of numerous amendments, H. 3992 was passed by the South Carolina House of Representatives and the South Carolina Senate and enrolled on July 26, 2011.

- 16. The General Assembly adopted H. 3992 after soliciting and receiving input from South Carolina voters and debating the merits of various plans. Prior to the General Assembly's consideration of H. 3992, the House Election Laws Subcommittee held nine public hearings in various cities across the State.
- 17. Acting on the public input, the House Election Laws Subcommittee adopted guidelines and criteria for congressional and legislative redistricting. The Subcommittee determined that any redistricting plan must comply with the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and established specific criteria to which the plans must adhere.
- 18. The Senate held ten public hearings across the State. After receiving public testimony, the Senate Judiciary Committee adopted Redistricting Guidelines for 2011. These guidelines mandated compliance with the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
- 19. After considering and debating the merits of various plans, the General Assembly enacted a plan that ultimately had strong support in both houses of the General Assembly.
- 20. H. 3992 was ratified on July 26, 2011, and was signed into law by Governor Nikki Randhawa Haley on August 1, 2011. Thus, the law is now ready for preclearance.
- 21. No part of H. 3992 can be implemented by the Plaintiffs until this Court enters a declaratory judgment as requested by Plaintiffs, or until the Attorney General indicates that he will not interpose an objection to implementation of H. 3992.
- 22. H. 3992 is ripe for a determination that the plan has neither the purpose nor the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and does not lead to a retrogression in the position of racial minorities or diminish their ability to elect their preferred candidates of choice on account of race.

23. It is important that the Court acts upon Plaintiffs' claims at the earliest practicable date. The election for the United States House of Representatives must be filled by election every two years, and the next election will occur on November 6, 2012. The candidate filing period for the 2012 election will open on March 16, 2012, and close on March 30, 2012. The state primary elections will be held on June 12, 2012, and any run-off primary elections will be held on June 26, 2012. Therefore, in order to preserve the existing election calendar, it is necessary that this Court consider and decide this controversy prior to the opening of the candidate filing period.

#### Count I

- 24. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs one through twenty-three is reaffirmed and realleged as if fully incorporated herein.
- 25. The last judicially approved Congressional redistricting plan in South Carolina (2002) had one majority-minority district, which maintained its status after the 2010 Census Data was applied to the 2002 redistricting plan ("Benchmark Plan").
- 26. H. 3992, when compared to the Benchmark Plan, retains the number of majority-minority districts sustained in the Benchmark Plan and, thus, does not lead to retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise or diminish their ability to elect their preferred candidates of choice, and does not otherwise have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.
- 27. H. 3992 does not have the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.
- 28. In addition to complying with the United States Constitution, the South Carolina Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, H. 3992 adheres to legitimate state redistricting

policies, including contiguity, compactness, maintaining communities of interests, and protecting incumbency.

29. Plaintiffs are entitled to a judgment that H. 3992 fully complies with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, and that H. 3992 may be implemented without further delay.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

- (a) Convene a three-judge district court to hear the matters raised in Plaintiffs' Complaint;
- (b) Issue such orders and convene such conferences as may be necessary on an expedited basis to ensure that what little discovery may be necessary in this action be taken and completed as expeditiously as possible;
- (c) Enter such other and further orders as may be necessary during the pendency of this case to ensure that it is handled as expeditiously as possible;
- (d) Enter a declaratory judgment that H. 3992 satisfies Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act because it has neither the purpose nor the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, or of diminishing minority voters' ability to elect their preferred candidates of choice, and that H. 3992 may be enforced by Plaintiffs; and
- (e) Grant Plaintiffs such other and further relief as may be appropriate, including the costs of this action.

#### Signature page follows

Respectfully submitted,

#### **BAKER HOSTETLER**

E. Mark Braden
D.C. Bar No. 419915

mbraden@bakerlaw.com
Washington Square, Suite 1100

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036-5304

(202) 861-1504

Attorneys for Plaintiff Robert W. Harrell

**JONES DAY** 

Michael A. Carvin D.C. Bar No. 366784 macarvin@jonesday.com

Louis K. Fisher

D.C. Bar No. 475502

lkfisher@jonesday.com

51 Louisiana Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 879-7643

Attorneys for Plaintiff Glenn F. McConnell

OF COUNSEL:

SOWELL GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, L.L.C.

Robert E. Stepp

Fed. I.D. No.: 4302

rstepp@sowellgray.com

Robert E. Tyson, Jr.

Fed. I.D. No.: 7815

rtyson@sowellgray.com

1310 Gadsden Street

Post Office Box 11449

Columbia, South Carolina 29211

(803) 929-1400

## WILLOUGHBY & HOEFER, P.A.

Benjamin P. Mustian Fed. I.D. No.: 9615

bmustian@willoughbyhoefer.com

Tracey Green Fed. I.D. No.: 6644

tgreen@willoughbyhoefer.com

930 Richland Street

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

(803) 252-3300

Attorneys for Plaintiff Robert W. Harrell

# Case 1:11-cv-01566-EGS Document 1-1 Filed 08/30/11 Page 1 of 2 CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS-44 (Rev. 2/11 DC)					,	N	11-1566	EGS	
I (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	ΓS				
Robert W. Harrell, on behalf of and in his official capacity as Speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and Glenn F. McConnell, in his official capacity as President Pro Tempore of the South Carolina Senate			The United States of America; Eric H. Holder, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States Office of General Counsel						
		 R	ichland /	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRS I LISTED DEFENDANT					
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF					
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM	<b></b> -			Case: 1:	·11-cv-0	01566	3		
E. Mark Braden, Bak NW, Washington, DO			it Avenue, i	Assigned To : Sullivan, Emmet G.					
l i	•	•		Assign. Date : 8/30/2011					
Michael A. Carvin, Jones Day, 51 Louisiana Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001 (202) 879-7643				Description: 3-Judge Court					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION			III CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!						
(PLACE AN x IN ON								DFT	
1 U S Governme Plaintiff	_	Question overnment Not a Party)	Citizen of this		O 1		orated or Principal P	_	O 4
2 U S Governmer	nt O 4 Diversit	y			~		ness in This State		<u> </u>
Defendant	,	e Citizenship of in item III)	Citizen of And	other State 🧿 2	O 2		corporated and Principal Place $\bigcirc$ 5 $\bigcirc$ 5 Business in Another State		
1 arties i			Citizen or Sub Foreign Count		O 3	Foreig	n Nation	O 6	O 6
<u>[</u>	IN CASE ASSOCIATION AND NATION OF STATE								
(Place a X in	IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT  (Place a X in one category, A-N, that best represents your cause of action and one in a corresponding Nature of Suit)								
O A. Antitrust	A. Antitrust O B. Personal Injury/ O C		0 C.	Administrative Agency		O D. Temporary Restraining			
	Malpractice		F	Review		Order/Preliminary			
			151	Medicare Act			Injuno	cuon	
410 Antitrust	310 Airplane   315 Airplane Product Liability   320 Assault, Libel & Stander		Social Se	Social Security:  861 HIA ((1395ff)  862 Black Lung (923)			Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case assignment.		
			) <del>-==</del>						
330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine		86	863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)   864 SSID Title XVI   865 RSI (405(g)			*(If Antitrust, then A governs)*			
İ	L L L 345 Marine Product Liability   1 ===								
	355 Motor Vo	Pehicle Product Liability Other S		tatutes 1 Agricultural Acts					
	360 Other Pe		89:	2 Economic Stabilization Act 3 Environmental Matters 4 Energy Allocation Act					
:	365 Product	Liability Product Liability	89						
		1 roduct Embiney	89	0 Other Statutory Actions (If Administrative Agency is Involved)					
O E. General Civil (Other) OR O F. Pro Se General Civil									
Real Property	_	Bankruptcy		Forfeiture/Pe					
210 Land Condemna 220 Foreclosure	ition	422 Appeal 28 423 Withdraw		610 Agri	culture er Food &Di	rug		alization Applic Immigration A	
230 Rent, Lease & E	jectment	Prisoner Petitions		625 Drug	g Related Se roperty 21 U	izure	470 Racke	teer Influenced pt Organization	&
245 Tort Product Lia	*	535 Death Pen	•	630 Liqu	or Laws	.SC 001	480 Consu	ımer Credit	***
290 All Other Real Property 540 Mandamu: 550 Civil Right			640 RR &			490 Cable	/Satellite TV ive Service		
Personal Property 555 Prison Conditio		ndition	660 Occupational Safety/Health			850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange			
371 Truth in Lending Property Rights			690 Othe	•		875 Custo	mer Challenge	12 USC	
380 Other Personal Property Damage		ts				3410  900 Appeal of fee determination			
		840 Trademar	-k	Other Statute	<u>es</u> Reapportio	nment	l	r equal access to itutionality of S	
		Federal Tax Suits	-lainei <b>c</b>	430 Bank	ks & Bankin		Statu	tes	_
		870 Taxes (US defendant	-		merce/ICC s/etc.			Statutory Action Iministrative ag	
}		871 IRS-Third		460 Depo	ortation		reviev	w or Privacy A	· 2

# Case 1:11-cv-01566-FGS | Document 1-1 | Filed 08/30/11 | Page 2 of 2

	1-CV-01300-EGS Docum		
G. Habeas Corpus/ 2255  530 Habeas Corpus-General 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee	O H. Employment  Discrimination  442 Civil Rights-Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability age, religion, retaliation)	O I. FOIA/PRIVACY ACT  895 Freedom of Information Act 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)	○ J. Student Loan  □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (excluding veterans)
	*(If pro se, select this deck)*	*(If pro se, select this deck)*	
O K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment)  710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Labor Railway Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Ac	C L. Other Civil Right (non-employment)  441 Voting (if not Voting Right Act)  443 Housing/Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights 445 American w/Disabilities- Employment 446 Americans w/Disabilities- Other	J10 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	
	O 3 Remanded from O 4 Reinston Appellate Court or Reo  THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WIlliam Court of the Voting Rights Act, 2	pened another district (specify)  UCH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A	6 Multi district
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS  ACTION UNDER F R C P 23	DEMAND \$	Check YES only if demanded in compla
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instruction)	NO If yes, please comp	olete related case form
DATE 08/30/2011	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECO	ORD SALE	ecti?
law, except as provided by local rules of co Court for the purpose of initiating the civil	Authority for O  the information contained herein neither replace. This form, approved by the Judicial Cor	TING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44 Civil Cover Sheet laces nor supplements the filings and service of frence of the United States in September 197 set is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each of	4, is required for the use of the Clerk of

- COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff is resident of 1. Washington, D.C., 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States
- CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section III. П
- IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the primary cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only one category. You must also select one corresponding nature of suit found under the category of case
- VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause
- VIII. RELATED CASES. IF ANY If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form

